

W. H. Kennell

THE  
Leviathan

HERETICAL:  
OR

The Charge Exhibited in Par-  
liament against M. *Hobbs*,  
justified by the Refutati-  
on of a Book of his,

Entituled  
The Historical Narration of  
*Heresie* and the Punish-  
ments thereof.

---

By JOHN DOWEL, Vicar of  
*Melton-Mowbray* in *Leicester* Shire.

---

O X O N  
Printed by *L. Lichfield*, and are  
to be sold by *Tho. Simmons*  
at the Princess Arms in Ludgate  
Street London 1683.

74-4101

Cambridge University Library  
On deposit from  
Peterborough Cathedral





# THE PREFACE.

**T**HE Author of this Tract may thus be reproached: Thus proached. Are not the Corps of dead men Sacred? To violate Tombs and Graves is Sacrilegious, why doth the Author intend to disturb the Manes of this universal Scholar? Will he not be permitted to sleep quietly in the Graves? How unworthy a thing is it to insult over a dead Lyon, and write a

## The Preface

gainst him who rests in the dust?  
The Author bears these words  
with a quiet mind; Certainly  
if to answer the works of those  
who are dead be so Criminal,  
how hainous offenders have so  
many writers in all ages been?  
and how Capital a Delinquent is  
Mr. Hobs, who hath by write-  
ing endeavoured to render the  
sentiments of the best and most  
learned men ridiculous. This  
Treatise discourseth with his  
Ghost; He dyed in 1679, and  
the Treatise came out in 80.  
Tis his umbra, it carries his  
own lineaments, and speaks his  
own language. A Reverend  
Neighbor Minister, a Learned  
Friend

## The Preface.

Friend of the Authors, acquainted him with the language of Mr. Hobs in private discourse, exactly agreeing with this Tract, and we find the most of it cap 1, and 2. de Heresi app. ad Leviath. Ed. Latina. I will acknowledge him a Gentleman of great parts, of a wonderful vivacity to his old age; that he had so fine a Pen, that by the clearness, and propriety of his Style, and exactness of his method, he gain'd more Profelytes than by his Principles: few exceed him in both languages, but these aggrandize his Crimes: he ought not to have abused such excellent

## The Preface

qualifications, he hath so managed his Pen, that many believe him unanswerable, yet let this Tract be considered, whether he be not fully refuted, as to the Contents of his Narrative. I will appeal to the Learned World, whether Mr. Hobs hath not thrown dirt and ugly expressions upon the Christian Religion, the best of Councils, the whole Christian Clergie, and hath abused the English Laws. It may be again objected, This Author durst not write whilst he was a live: Whom did Mr. Hobs ever answer, but the clear Pen of the Arch-B. of Armagh, and the Great Pro-

## The Preface

Professor Dr. Wallis? In the Verses which he made of himself he vaunts a Victory, the world is the Judge, if what he saith be true, That there is an Eternal Fate and Necessity: Why can he commend himself and discommend others? If in these Lines the Author does a thing ill, what reproof does he deserve, he is hurried to it by a fatal Necessity. On this account his praising himself, and dispraising others is groundless, he is charged with contradictions from a great one, of which he endeavours to vindicate himself, but 'tis in vain, his artifices are fruitless.

One

## The Preface

*One of his Moral and Political Principles is, That whatsoever is just or unjust, or to be received as true or false, is by the approbation or rejection of the Supreme Power. He writes his Leviathan, in which this is asserted and defended; yet in the same Leviathan he delivers those doctrines for true, which are judged Heretical by the Church of England, and Laws of the Kingdom: To evade this he useth all Art and Industry.*

*In the First part of this Answer some Doctrines which he propagated in that Book are proved Heretical. In the Lat-*

*ter*

## The Preface.

ter part is proved, That these  
Doctrines are Criminal, and  
the persons that maintain'd  
them are liable to be punished  
by the Civil Magistrate. His  
Book being An Historical  
Narrative, the Author is  
forc'd to have recourse to Books.  
Mr. Hobs gives us several  
Histories, but Quotes no Au-  
thour; whereupon the Answer-  
er is compelled to cite the place  
whence he has taken them. No  
Memory, Reading, Under-  
standing or Observation is infi-  
nite, therefore the Authour  
sometime useth this or the like  
expression, so as to him it occurs;  
he abstaines from all virulent  
language;

## The Preface.

language; the hardest word,  
and that but once used, is Notor-  
iously false. Mr. Hobs gives  
occasion to dispute a great part  
of his Leviathan, but the An-  
swerer prosecutes his design, to  
make good the Contradiction;  
as for Instance, Mr. Hobs a-  
verrs That God hath Parts;  
here is a just occasion to dispute  
The Nature of Spirits, but the  
Authour waves it, 'tis sufficient  
to prove That the Church of  
England has judged that Pro-  
position Heretical, and there-  
upon has contradicted himself:  
He asserts, That they who  
embrace the Liberty of the  
Will are allyed to the Mani-  
chees.



## The Preface.

chees. This gives a fair opportunity to discourse of Liberty and Necessity: and he that seriously considers himself, will find, the freedom of his Will ariseth not from the flexibility of the Understanding, flowing from various impressions upon that faculty, but from the Dominion which the Will has over it self, which the Greeks excellently express by *αὐτοκρατία*, but the Author does not meddle with that Controversie, contenting himself with the Demonstration of the absurdity of Mr. Hobbs his Imputation, and that it is contrariant to the Doctrine of the Church of England. The  
Do-

## The Preface.

Doctrine of the Sacred Trinity  
is religiously embrac'd and en-  
tertained by the Church of Eng-  
land, as it was by the Church  
of Christ in all ages; hence Lu-  
cian in his Philopatriis jeer'd  
the Primitive Christians for be-  
lieving such an incredible opini-  
on. That ~~was~~ should be "Ex,  
and" ~~et~~ <sup>in</sup> ~~una~~, (i. e.) Tres U-  
nus, and Unus Tres, Three  
Persons and One God; which  
pass shows sufficiently the Faith  
of the Primitive Church. The  
Author does not therefore di-  
spute the Doctrine of the Trini-  
ty, but wipes off all that Var-  
nish with which Mr. Hobs-  
wetch to hide the deformity of  
his

## The Epistle.

*his sentiments, and makes him appear in his proper Colours; proves him Heretical, in being an enemy to the Faith, and Doctrine of the Church of England. The like may be said of other things which the Author treats of, the charge being made good, that Mr. Hobs has notoriously contradicted himself: His book is answered, and his great Postulatum demonstrated to be false, in that he is forc'd to acknowledge those things which are contrary to it.*

A

B

H

A

are

the

or

ric

th

La

mi

---

A  
DISCOURSE  
OF  
HERESIE.

**A**<sup>ἡρесь</sup> is a Greek word, and the derivations that are given of *Herésie* from other words then *αἵρεσις*, Greek or Latine, are fond and spurious. It was a word amongst the Philosophers, Greek and Latine, us'd for any Sect promiscuously, and so the ac-

B 2      ception

ception is indifferent ; but 'tis otherwise in sacred Scripture, in Ecclesiastical Writers, Fathers, and Historians, amongst whom 'tis alwaies us'd in an evil sense, the *Acts of the Apostles* being excepted, where *αἵρεσις* is alwaies translated *Sect*, only *Acts* 24. 14. 'tis probable 'tis used in an ill sense. The Reason may be this, The Catholic Church being one, what opinion was broached by any, contrary to the Catholic Church, receiv'd an ill stamp, and was called *Heresie*. The several opinions of the Philosophers were not branded with

with an ill name, they were not so fixed to one School, that it should be impious to be of another: but 'tis otherwise in the Church of Christ (which owneth the Holy Jesus to be her Master, and Founder, and glorying that she is the Pillar and ground of Truth) whosoever sets up for himself, and divulgeth to the world an opinion contrary to the doctrine of the Church, he himself was judged an Heretick, and his opinion, an Heresie: On this account in the Church of Christ, in all ages the word *Heresie* was not a word

of a middle, or indifferent  
sense, but of an evil, and  
reproachful acceptation.

'Tis granted, that the Ro-  
man Empire was full of Phi-  
losophers when the Gospel  
was preached, and that some,  
not many, were converted:  
but it is denied that most of  
the Pastors of the Church  
were chosen out of these  
Philosophers: The primi-  
tive Christians had a migh-  
ty jealousy of them, and the  
greatest Philosophers which  
were Christians, were not  
Bishops: such were the Pro-  
fessors and Masters in the  
School of *Alexandria*, as *Pan-*  
*tanus*.



*tenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, &c.* The Heathens objected against the Christians, that few of them were Learned, which caused St. Jerome to write his Book *De Viris Illustribus*.

'Tis a great attestation to the truth of Christianity, that it appeared when Philosophy so much flourished in the world. Those great Wits, which were so vastly furnished with Oratory, Learning, and the Tongues, if there had been any cheat acted by the Christians they would easily have detected it: therefore when Christ

Christ profest that by his works he might be known, he and his Apostles wrought those Miracles which gave a clear attestation to his doctrine. No doubt, but some of these Philosophers were converted, but that (by reason of their great skill in Oratory and Philosophy) most of the Primitive Church were chosen out of the number of these Philosophers; 'Tis deny'd. In the Primitive Church for the three first Centuries, there was not a Philosopher made a Bishop.

When Christians became  
numerous

numerous  
Children  
Philosophers  
Scientists  
persons  
if any  
ed w  
Hobbes  
fists  
phic  
Scri  
own  
He  
Ch  
Ho  
Ch  
St  
an  
an

numerous, they sent their Children to be instructed in Philosophy and the Liberal Sciences, who became brave persons. But I am ignorant if any Philosopher converted was made a Bishop. What *Hobbs* averrs, that these Pastors retaining their Philosophical *Dogma's*, interpreting Scriptures according to their own Sect, that thus at first *Heresie* entered into the Church, is not true; for *Heresie* was crept into the Church in the Apostles time, St. *Paul* commands Christians to beware of *Heresies*, and St. *Peter* saith there are those

those who shall privily bring  
 in damnable *Heresies*. I do  
 acknowledge *Tertullian* wrote  
 smartly and truly, when he  
 term'd Philosophers the Pa-  
 triarchs of Hereticks. De  
*prescriptione*. Irenæus *Lib. 2.*  
*Cap. 19.* gives us an ac-  
 count from what Philoso-  
 phers the *Valentinian* and  
*Gnostick Heresies* borrow'd  
 their absurd and monstrous  
 opinions, But then we must  
 say, that these Hereticks  
 were not Pastors in the  
 Church. The first that  
 broach't those prodigious o-  
 pinions was *Simon Magus*,  
 who was onely baptiz'd. In  
 the

of Heresie.

the first Century, there was not one Heretick, which was a Pastor or Bishop in the Church of Christ. The *Heresie* of the *Nicholaitans* took its rise from *Nicholas* one of the Seven Deacons: he did not broach that *Heresie*, but some who misinterpreted a passage of his, were the Authors of it. Nor any of the Christian Clergy was the Author of any *Heresie* in the second Century. *Tatius* was a great Orator converted by *Justin Martyr*, and was the Author of the *Heresie* of the *Encratites*, but he was not of the Clerical order. In the third

third Century. *Novatus* a Roman Presbyter broach't his *Hereſie* (I ſpeak according to the beſt knowledge I have in the Church hiſtory) viz. concerning the not receiving the *Lapſi* into Communion, but he was not a Philoſopher, nor was his opinions anywiſe a kin to the *Dogma's* of the heathen Philoſophers. *Nepos* was an *Ægyptian* Biſhop; not a profeſt Philoſopher; a perſon of great excellency in many things, the Author of the opinion of Chriſts reigning a 1000 years upon Earth, which opinion is founded, not upon any of the Principles of

of Philosophy, but upon some passages in the Revelations. *Paulus Samosatenus* made Bishop of *Antioch*, was the broacher of many evil Doctrines, but he was not a Philosopher.

The design of Mr. *Hobbs* easily appears, he every where casts severe Reflections upon Christianity, and its Professors. The Apostle condemns vain Philosophy, Col. 2. which in the sence of *Cl Alexandrinus* is the Epicurean Philosophy, from which *Hobs* borrows his Principles, Moral, Natural, and Political. "Upon the rising of a  
C "new

“new opinion, the Pastors  
“of the Church assemble  
“themselves, if the Author of  
“that Novelty persisted con-  
“trary to the determinati-  
“on of the Church, he was  
“laid aside, and consider-  
“ed as an heathen man (*i. e.*)  
“they excommunicated him;  
“other punishments they  
“could inflict none. This  
shall be easily granted, but  
what he subjoyns is utterly  
to be refused: That all the  
punishments the Church  
could inflict, was only ig-  
nominy; by this one stroke  
of his pen he hath cancel’d  
the New Testament. To  
say,



say, that excommunication, or casting a man out of the Church, or esteeming him as an heathen man, was but Infamy, 'tis to deny Christianity. One of the great offices of the Church was Ecclesiastical discipline and the divine censures, of which excommunication was the severest, and is still, if duely manag'd, the greatest punishment. To be thrown out of the Church, to be depriv'd of the Prayers of the Church, to have no part in those offices of Religion, by which the Grace and Favour of God is obtain'd, and to

be delivered to Satan, is this Infamy onely? To be outlaw'd, whereby a person is depriv'd of the benefit and liberty of the law; he is deprived of the liberty of his Countrey, he enjoys not a free air, house, nor harbor, and by reason a Capital penalty is inflicted on those who afford him any reception or give him any relief, he is exposed to the utmost peril of ruine except the outlawry be reversed. Is this only Infamy? The Calamity that Excommunication involves a person in, is far greater. For Excommunication according to

to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church was reputed a sentence excluding the Excommunicated Persons from the Kingdome of Heaven: and hence by *Tertullian* in his Apology called *futuri judicii præjudicium*. Is this onely Infamy? He might have said, that Christianity is nothing, the promises and threatnings contained in it are mere Chimæra's: thence, tho they that embrace it, do entertain such a belief, tis but a fancy, therefore all the evil which attends by excommunication is onely Infamy. Excommunication was not

onely for *Heresies*, but likewise for immoralities and excommunication did not brand a man for an *Heretick*, but the person being rendred infamous for his *Heresie* was (if in the bosome of the Church) cast out. That *Heretick* and *Catholick* became not Relatives by this excommunication, nor by this did *Heretick* become a name, and a name of disgrace both together. A Person by becoming an *Heretick* was excommunicated, this name did precede, not follow excommunication. It must be acknowledged, that the *Heresies* concern-

cerning the Trinity were very troublesome in the Church, but not so vexatious during the ten Persecutions, as in *Constantines* time, and after; but what is the cause, that when he proposes the Troubles arising from the Doctrine of the Trinity, he would mix those doctrines which were wholly alienated from the doctrine of the Trinity, as those of the *Manichees*.

“For, saith he, according  
“to the usual Curiosity of  
“Natural Philosophy, they  
“could not abstain from dis-  
“puting the first principles  
of

“ of Christianity, into which  
 “ they were Baptized in the  
 “ name of the Father, Son,  
 “ and Holy - Ghost. Some  
 “ there were who made them  
 “ Allegorical; others would  
 “ make one Creator of Good  
 “ another of Evil. This was  
 “ the principal Tenet of the  
 “ *Manichees*, who took their  
 “ Names from one *Manes*.  
 “ This Monstrous opinion,  
 “ that there were two Eter-  
 “ nal Principles, Light and  
 “ Darkneſs, theſe were two  
 “ Contrary Gods, the one the  
 “ Author of Good, the other  
 “ of Evil. What is this to  
 “ the Trinity? That which  
 he

he at  
 red.  
 “ the  
 “ tha  
 “ cau  
 “ to  
 “ ov  
 Tru  
 man  
 Aut  
 dati  
 life  
 two  
 “ E  
 “ t  
 “ r  
 “ i  
 “  
 C

he adds is not to be endured. " From which doctrine  
" they are not far distant  
" that now make the first  
" cause of Sinful actions  
" to be every man as to his  
" own Sin. Is this great  
Truth Manichism? To say  
man by his free-will is the  
Author of Sin. In commen-  
dation of himself in his own  
life thus? " I Printed then  
two treatises that stung the  
" Bishop *Bramhal* in his Mo-  
" ther Tongue. The ques-  
" tion at the time was, and  
" is still, whether at Gods,  
" or our own choice we will:  
Can we will evil at Gods  
choice?

choice? We therefore do affirm expressly contrariant to Mr. *Hobs*, that the causation of Evil cannot be attributed to God without Impiety. He mentioning our late fatal Wars thus—

—*Such Crimes and Sufferings I will not impute unto the Deity.*

I have no Sence if this be not a Repugnancy, in this Tract he affirms that those who assert, that the causation of Evil cannot be attributed to God are allyed to the *Manichees*.

And yet when in the Verses, which respect his life, he



he recounts the English Evils and Calamities during the Wars, he dares not impute them to the Deity. Truly how far this Opinion is from *Manichæism*, let the World Judge. Can any man have sence to believe, that if Sin flows from God the first Cause, but it must be attributed to him? The *Manichees* believe an Eternal being the Author of all Evil. Take their Monstrous opinion from themselves. There was an Epistle which they in *St. Austin* called the *Fundamentum*, and thus begins, *Manichæus*

*chaus Apostolus Jesu Christi*  
*Providentiâ Dei Patris, ha*  
*sunt salubria verba de vivo*  
*perenni Fonte. Manichæus the*  
 Apostle of Jesus Christ by the  
 Providence of God the Fa-  
 ther these are sound and  
 wholsœ words flowing from  
 a Liveing and Perpetua  
 Fountain. In this Epistle  
 thus, *In exordio fuere due sub*  
*stantie a se divisa &c.* In the  
 begining there were two  
 substances divided from one  
 another. God the Father had  
 the cōmand of Light; and  
 then he proceeds to describe  
 that kingdom, he then goes to  
 the Kingdome of Darknes,  
 which

wh  
 Lig  
 tion  
 Dar  
 coun  
 that  
 Tra  
 ther  
 bein  
 some  
 mix  
 men  
 Tha  
 com  
 what  
 of D  
 of hi  
 witc  
 who

which was at the side of  
Light, giving a wild descrip-  
tion of that Kingdome of  
Darkness. He gives an ac-  
count of the Black King of it,  
that he with his hideous  
Train assaulted God the Fa-  
ther, the King of Light; who  
being affraid of him, sent  
some of his Troops, who  
mixing with the Black Regi-  
ments, formed his World.  
That what is Good must  
come from the King of Light,  
what is bad from the King  
of Darkness. These frenzies  
of him who was *Marlax* be-  
witched once that great man,  
who by the Grace of God bee  
D ing-

ing inlightned fell from them  
to the Catholic Church.

St. *Augustine* a Presbyter  
in *Hippo* disputes *Fortunatus*  
a *Manichean* Presbyter of  
that City. Both dispute a-  
bout the *Original of the Evil of*  
*Sin*, he assigns it to the *Black*  
*Prince*, & quitting the Cause  
affirmed, it could have no o-  
ther Original then from the  
Evil Nature of the Prince of  
Darkness. The like we find  
in his second dispute with  
*Felix* the *Manichean*. Saint  
*Austin* assigns rightly this to  
the Free will of man. It can-  
not enter into my head, why  
Mr. *Hobs* should give this  
assertions

assertion, my understanding  
is too shallow to fathom this  
depth.

Nothing farther to be re-  
proved till we come to the  
6 page, onely this passage  
may receive a little Censure  
pag 6 "*Constantine* the great  
" was made by the valor and  
" assistance of the Christian  
" Soldiers sole Emperor. He  
not much regarding the pe-  
culiar Providence of God,  
takes nonotice of that great  
miracle of y<sup>e</sup> Cross appearing  
at Noon, with this inscription  
ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΟΥ. The whole Army  
of *Constantine* was inferior to  
*Magentius* his Forces, &  
D 2 small

small number of his Soldiers were Christians, it was more the peculiar action of the Arme of Heaven, which dissipated the Army of *Magnentius*, and gave the Eagles to *Constantine*. "In the latter end of his time there arose a dispute between *Alexander* the Bishop, and *Arrius* the Presbyter of that City. Here the Philosopher hath erred in his Chronology, for the quarrel between them began before the *Licinian* Persecution, in the Tenth of *Constantine's*: who commanded the Empire 37 years. Would this was the worst

Er-

Errors  
 "syb  
 "and  
 "can  
 "the  
 "she  
 "ty.  
 "the  
 "ve  
 "it  
 "C  
 "an  
 "th  
 "p  
 "o  
 "the  
 "Aa  
 "tho  
 "im

Error! "This Controver-  
 "sy between the Inhabitants  
 "and Souldiers, presently be-  
 "came a quarrel, and was  
 "the cause of much blood-  
 "shed in and about the Ci-  
 "ty. This so far concerned  
 "the Emperors Civil go-  
 "vernment, that he thought  
 "it necessary to call a general  
 "Council of all the Bishops  
 "and other eminent Divines  
 "throwout the Roman Em-  
 "pire, to meet at the City  
 "of Nice. Indeed I read in  
 the Time of *Constantius*, the  
*Aarrians* prosecuted the *Ca-*  
*tholicks* with the greatest fury  
 imaginable. The lamenta-  
 D 3 ble

ble Tragedy of which is given us by an *Alexandrian* Synod, in their Letters to *Julius* Bishop of *Rome*. But that any murders were committed during the Reign of *Constantine*, I do not observe but to lessen the honour of Christian Religion, he assigns the calling of that Council to the Peace of the Empire. The prime reason was the Establishing the Peace of the Church, and the Uniformity in Doctrine, which will be manifested, he said to the Fathers in his Exhortation to them, "That they would fall in hand with

the



“ the Articles of Faith, and  
“ whatsoever they should de-  
“ cree therein, he would cause  
to be Observed: On which  
he thus Animadverts, “ This  
“ may perhaps seem a great  
“ indifferency, then would  
“ in these Days be approved  
“ off. I know not the sence  
of this reflection, for what  
could be more desired by a  
Council of the Emperor, then  
to assure them that he would  
ratify those Canons which  
they decreed, concerning the  
things they were called for.  
The main of the discourse is  
concerning his animadver-  
sions on this Article, *Begotten,*  
not

not made, being of one Substance with the Father. Thus he. " In this they censure  
 " the doctrine of *Arrius*, for  
 " this word, of one Substance, in Latine *Consubstantialis* in Greek *ὁμοούσιος* was  
 " put as a touch-stone to discern an *Arrian* from a *Catholick*, and much ado their  
 " was about it. Thus far tis true, but the verity of the subsequent discourse must be considered.

" *Constantine* himself at the passing of it took it for an  
 " hard Word, but yet approved it : The account is given by *Eusebins* in his Epistle

to

to his flock, in *Casarea, Theod.*  
*lib. 1. cap. 12.* he acquaints  
 them what a form of sound  
 words he presented to the  
 Synod at *Nice*, w<sup>ch</sup> the Em-  
 peror and Synod allowed and  
 approved: but the Synod  
 was not satisfied except this  
 one word *ὁμοούσιος* was infer-  
 ted; whereupon the Synod  
 entered into a long debate,  
 and it past *in angustia* &c. we  
 did not admit without enqui-  
 ry, which was after this man-  
 ner. That word *of one sub-*  
*stance* was not to be under-  
 stood according to any Cor-  
 poreal passion; That it was  
 not a Subsistence by any di-

vi-

vision or abscission from the Father. For an immaterial, intellectual, and incorporeal Nature can't be the subject of Corporeal passions, it behov'd that such things ought to be express'd in divine and arcane words. Thus our most wise and religious Emperour did Philosophise. And *Theoderet*, cap. 13. saith that word *θεῖος* was not invented by the Fathers, but received from former ages, and devolved from Fathers to Children: *Constantine* calling that word *Divine* not because it was in the divine Scripture, for it was not

not  
ledg  
" wa  
suffi  
*Hob*  
to ca  
Cou  
be f  
the  
ly u  
of t  
und  
at  
kno  
Go  
sub  
not  
fle  
un

not there, This is acknowledged. " But because it  
" was to him an *Arcanum* not  
sufficiently understood, Mr.  
*Hobs* takes all the occasion  
to cast a contempt upon the  
Council; tis fit their should  
be suitable words, for tho  
the mystery cannot be right-  
ly understood, yer the sence  
of the word may very well be  
understood. This word *is* ~~is~~  
~~is~~ may well enough be  
known, yet how the son of  
God should be of the same  
substance with the Father, is  
not so intelligible, his re-  
flection upon the Emperor is  
unworthy a Gentleman.  
" And

And in this appeared the  
 indifference of the Empe  
 ror, and that he had for his  
 end in calling the Synod  
 not so much the Truth as  
 the Uniformity of the doc  
 trine, and the Peace of his  
 People yet depended on it.

This is a most notorious  
 scandal; What! the famous  
*Constantine*, who put a period  
 to persecution, restored peace  
 to Christians, and made  
 Christianity to flourish, what  
 this *Constantine* to play the  
 Hypocrite? *Constantine* did  
 desire the Uniformity in  
 Doctrine, but not in an e-  
 vil Doctrine, and the Peace  
 of

of his  
 not be  
 dation  
 Betw  
 peror  
 he wa  
 Faith  
 his D  
 his  
 Chu  
 who  
 stant  
 befo  
 Con  
 Con  
 and  
 rati  
 find  
 sign  
 of

of his people, but he would not build this upon the foundation of Sin and *Heresy*. Before that celebrated Emperor convened the Council, he was convinced of the true Faith, which appeared by his Discourse with *Arrius*, and his large letter to the Churches in *Romania*. They who read the letters of *Constantine* concerning *Arrius* before the Council was call'd *Constantines* Edict, for the Convening of the Fathers, and his pious and sweet Orations to the Council, will find, that *Constantine's* Designe was, that so great an

E Assem-

Assembly of the best Divines should settle the Church upon the Foundation of Truth and peace. Further, the cause of the obscurity of this word *quies* proceeded clearly from the difference of the Greek and Roman dialect in the Philosophy of the Peripateticks, what should cast Mr. Hobs into this sentiment cannot understand; all his subsequent discourse is of Essence or *ousia*. As to this I know no difference in the Greek and Latine Dialect. Both Greek and Latine in the Sence of that agreed. The *Arrians*

and



and Catholicks were Harmo-  
nious.

As to the *vain*, why Mr.  
*Hobs* should make their differ-  
ence to consist in that which  
they did agree, is to me un-  
intelligible. The difference  
lay in the Adjective; there  
is one letter (*iota*) that  
makes it; all Schools agree  
in this, that *like* is not the  
same; the *Arrians* would  
allow the *ὁμοούσιον*, of a sub-  
stance like to the father, but  
not this *ὁμοούσιον* of the same  
Substance with the Father.  
It manifestly appears to be  
a wild excursion of Mr. *Hobs*  
to discourse and quibble upon

the Sense of this word Essence, and Substance, when the dispute did not lye in that; yet if there be a connexion in his discourse, in that, according to him, it ~~may~~ consist: but we will follow him in the Chace. The first principle of all Religion in all Nations is, God is. This is instruction. That is to say, that God really is something, and not a meere fancy. This is not well sayd, It is without diminution, for when we understand the Notion of a God, then we must have a conception of a being which is infinite

fin  
ful,  
"w  
"is  
"f  
"f  
"a  
"w  
"h  
"M  
"h  
"b  
"le  
"d  
"C  
"it  
thi  
sw

finutely wise, Good, Power-  
ful, Eternal. &c. "but that  
"which is really something  
"is considerable alone by it  
"self, as being somewhere,  
"so the Earth, the Air are  
"all of them things real;  
"whatsoever is in any place  
"hath dimension, that is to say  
"Magnitude, and this which  
"hath Magnitude whether it  
"be visible or invisible is cal-  
"led by all the learned a Bo-  
"dy. If it be finite, & body or  
"Corporeal, if it be infinite,  
"it followeth, that all real  
things in that they are some-  
where, are corporeal. which  
Para-

Paragraph gives occasion of these 2 considerable things.

1. Whether there be any real being but that which is a body, and hath magnitude?

2. Wherein the Nature of Infinity consists? As to the first

we will grant, that all learn'd men say whatsoever hath

Magnitude is a Body; yet it must be affirmed, that the

most and best of the *Literati* affirm, that there are real

Beings, which are not bodies, and have no Magnitude,

The chief of which we say is God, and tis impossible to

have any conception of a God

God

from

a Bod

cessi

such

perer

Attr

bilit

that

can

Om

thin

ten

Eye

tem

and

to

duc

tion

God, but he must remove from him the conception of a Body ; A Body must of necessity be divisible and have such parts w<sup>ch</sup> can't be competent to a Deity, so that great Attribute of God's Immutability is lost, He being a thing that may be changed ; nor can this consist with Gods Omnipotency ; how can we think matter can be omnipotent, if we seriously cast our Eyes upon this world to contemplate its beauty, order and greatness ; Is't possible to conceive, that it is the product of Matter ? No, the notion of a God must include  
in

in its self the Notion of Infinity. An Infinite cannot consist of finite parts; several finites cannot amount to one infinite, therefore God cannot have parts, wherefore it must be acknowledged, that there is a being which is not corporeal, and farther tis most certain that *Hobbes* contradicts his own great principle, that the Supreme Power is the sole Judge of Good and Evil, Truth and Falsehood. He is a Subject to the King of *England* by whose law the *Nicene Council* was ratified, which decreed that God is an immaterial

trial and incorporeal Substance, and by his own Law hath declared that God hath no parts.

2. As to the Nature of a Thing infinite, there can be but two just acceptions of it.

It signifies a being which includes in it self all perfections, and so it connotes the great God, the Eternal Majesty, and this infers, there cannot be two Infinites, for there must not be two of all perfections. 2. Or a being that is boundless, or hath no terme. The name Infinite may be given to other things, as

as an Infinite Sea because it cannot be exhausted, take is m what water out of it you will please, the Sea remaines as full that as before; Infinite words infinite Infinite Numbers; yet they are bounds to them, the Sea cannot be fathomed, Words mere have their Numbers; none can imagine a line drawn that is such a length but it may be drawn longer; fancy any number, there may be an addition, these are not properly Infinites, as a little Stick we see bounded, yet divided it may be into Infinite parts (i. e.) it will be still capable of division, for nothing is



is material, but each part  
you will be material: 'Tis clear  
that nothing can be esteemed  
infinite but Space, in my ap-  
prehension. Space simply  
conceived is nothing, 'tis a  
mere imagination, so it ap-  
pears, that nothing Corpore-  
al is Infinite. That which he  
subjoyns concerning Essence;  
and Deity shall be conside-  
red, what he says of White-  
ness and Blackness will be  
granted but what he in-  
tends by it, shall be present-  
ly examined. " These Re-  
al things, are called by the  
" Latine Philosophers *Entia*,  
" *subiecta*, *substantia*, and by  
" The

“ the Greek Philosophers,

“ τὰ ὄντα, ὑποκείμενα, ὑπεστέμνε

“ The other which are In

“ corporeal, are called by the

“ Greek Philosophers,

“ συμβεβηχότα, παλαιάματα but

“ most of the Latine Philoso

“ phers use to convert ὄντα

“ into *substantia*, and so con

“ found real and corporeal

“ things with incorporeal

“ which is not well. For E

“ sence and Substance signifie

“ divers things. To which

“ is thus returned; why doth

“ Mr. *Hobs* call any thing In

“ corporeal, when he asserts

“ there's nothing but what is

“ a Body?

What

2.

substa

things

are n

faith

are fa

seeing

their

feren

are fo

stratu

may

3.

phers

not

these

τίσιν

jects

the c

2. What philosophers say *substantia* are τὰ ὄντα, other things are so called which are not *substantia*; and who saith that White and Black are *substantia* and *subiecta*, seeing white and black have their *substrata*, which are different from them, and they are separable, for that *substratum* which is now white, may anon be black.

3. By the Greek Philosophers Incorporeal things are not called συμβεβηκότα, for these are *accidentia*; nor φαντάσματα, for the *spectra* are subjects of the eye, and what is the object of sense is materi-

F

al,

al. but they are by them cal-  
led αἴα σώματα πρῶτα.

The Latine Authors doe  
well in translating εἶα some-  
times *Substantia*, sometimes  
*Essentia*, Essence and Sub-  
stance do differ, but the Greek  
is copious. εἶα signifies Es-  
sence and Substance, expressly  
*Arist lib. 4. cap. 9.* gives these  
two significations of εἶα, that  
it signifies both Essence and  
Substance. The Latines take  
their measures from the  
Greeks. They confound not  
Essence and Substance, who  
give the just Translation ac-  
cording to the true sense, it  
having divers acceptations,

and th  
truely

Substa

‘A

ceiv

thes

both

‘vini

‘tia f

‘we f

‘of t

‘that

‘were

‘out

‘1, 2

‘Ver

‘of

‘expre

‘phers

and

and therefore this  $\delta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\sigma\theta$  is  
truely rendred *One of the same*  
*Substance*.

‘ And this mistake is re-  
‘ ceiv’d, and continues still in  
‘ these parts, in all disputes  
‘ both of Philosophy and Di-  
‘ vinity; for in truth *Essen-*  
‘ *tia* signified no more than if  
‘ we should talk ridiculously  
‘ of the *Isness* of the thing,  
‘ that is, (By whom all things  
‘ were made) this is prov’d  
‘ out of *Sr. John*, Cap. 1. Verse  
‘ 1, 2, 3. and *Heb.* Cap. 1.  
‘ Ver. 3. and that again out  
‘ of *Gen.* 1. To make those  
‘ expressions which Philoso-  
‘ phers us’d ridiculous he thus  
F 2 form’d

form'd this word *Isneß* *St*  
*Jerome* upon these words of  
 the wise man, *There's no new*  
*thing under the Sun*, quote  
 his Master *Donatus*, reading  
 upon *Terence*, *Nil dictum*  
*quod non prius dictum*, *De*  
*pereant qui nostra ante nos dic-*  
*erunt*. That great Rhetor  
 cian, and Gramarian might  
 be the Inventor of some new  
 words, or new explanation  
 of the same thing but not else.  
 Mr. *Hobbs* is the sole Inven  
 tor of the word *Isneß*, but  
 his *Leviathan* principles were  
 prepared to his hands by far  
 ciful and not thinking men  
 words mightily prevail. Th

rever  
 the A  
 wild  
 Phan  
 in h  
 whic  
 rious  
 ever  
 his  
 abou  
 Crea  
 Phan  
 grea  
 Mr.  
 by  
 renc  
 Phi  
 ere  
 St

reverend Mr. *Calvin* against the Anabaptists, and other wild persons, us'd the word Phanatick. The Great Monk in his Southern Journey which he manag'd with as curious and fine Stratagems as ever a General did, to expose his adversaries (the Army abounding with such sort of Creatures) he call'd them Phanaticks, which was of great efficacy; perhaps 'tis Mr. *Hobbs*. his imagination by this odd word *Isness* to render *Essentia*, us'd by the Philosophers, contemptible ere long (it may be) on the Stage. And this *Isness* amongst  
*Drolls*

Drolls may serve to make  
 Conceit more pleasant: If He  
 would have recollected what  
 he said of Speech. Cap. 40  
*Leviathan*; that words signify  
 as they are usually under-  
 stood, then if *Isness* had been  
 used in a common vogue to  
 denote the same with *Essence*  
 who would have reprov'd it  
 He quarrels with the Father  
 and Divines of Note for con-  
 founding the *Concrete* with  
 the *Abstract*, *Deus* with *Dei-  
 tas*, *Ens* with *Essentia*, *Sa-  
 piens* with *Sapientia*, *Æternus*  
 with *Æternitas*: In my ap-  
 prehension, the Philosophers  
 do not confound themselves

for



for they suppose a distinction,  
which to me thus appears:  
*Essentia* the Nature, *Ens* the  
thing it self. I may have ap-  
prehensions of a thing, and  
the Nature of a thing; the  
Philosophers make no con-  
fusion, none of them say  
that *Sapiens* is *Sapientia*; if  
they did so, they might tru-  
ly say, that *Covetousness* is  
a *Covetous* man, and *Holyness*  
is a *Holy* man &c. as he by  
this would render them con-  
temptible: by a *Concrete* they  
understand a Thing com-  
pounded of *Substance* and  
*Forms*, by an *abstract* they  
conceive a *Form* without the  
Subject

*Subject*; as *Wisdom*, not considering the man that is *Wise*. I may at the same time have a conception of *Wisdom*, and not have the conception of a *wise* man. No Philosopher doth say that *wisdom*, and a *wise* man are the same, nor *Covetousness*, and a *Covetous* man are the same. The Schools and Philosophers in speaking of the *Deity* do fear to speak of *God* with any irreverence, & therefore upon just ground admit not any composition in *God* amongst them. *Deitas* and *Deus* are the same, and by reason that there is nothing *Eternal*, but *God*, in Him

Him  
 the fa  
 cieve  
 of m  
 ted b  
 such  
 isten  
 ford  
 con  
 is o  
 con  
 Ex  
 the  
 stir  
 Con  
 str  
 it  
 if  
 w

Him *æternus* & *æternitas* are the same : For when we conceive a distinction in the mind of man, it is concerning created beings; but we have none such in God. *Essence* and *Existence* of created beings afford two different *modes* of conceiving, but the contrary is of God. There is but one conception of the *Essence* and *Existence* of a God, and of them there is no sort of distinction : The *Abstract* and *Concrete*, and *Concrete* and *Abstract* are the same, therefore it must be ill said of him: For if *Deitas* abstracted be *Deus*, we make two Gods of one.

Must then no such word as *Essence* be used? only *Body*? surely the word *Nature* may be used? what is this *Corporeal*? by that means I may use the word *Essential*. His aim is higher, that is, at the *Trinity*, from that mystery of Faith he takes all his *Grandeur*. Thus Mr. *Hobs*, *The Attributes therefore of God in the abstract, when they are put for God, are put Metonymically, which is a common thing in Scripture; as for Example, Prov. 8. 21. Before the Mountains were settled, before the Hills brought forth was I. The Wisdom there spoken of being* the

the wis  
same n  
sacred  
dom o  
mean  
y@,  
this i  
rians  
know  
ment  
Chri  
ende  
ōpo  
to b  
funa  
Fulg  
anon  
um  
tur  
star

as the wisdom of God, signifies the same with the wise God. In the sacred Scripture by the *Wisdom of God*, is sometimes meant the *Son of God*, the ὁ λόγος, the *Eternal Word*, and this is not denied by the *Arrians* themselves. They acknowledging that *Wisdom* mentioned by *Solomon* is *Christ the Son of God*, do endeavour to prove him not ὁμοῦς ἐστίν, because he is said to be according to the greek *fundata sum*, and as cited by *Fulgentius contra object. Arrianorum obj. Creavit me Initium viarum suarum*. A  *Creature* is not of the same substance, tho the *Arrians* falsely

ly applyed those words, yet tis certain that by the wisdom of God mentioned in that chapter, was not as Mr. *Hobs* saith *Metonimically* by them taken for the wise God, but a being subsistent by it self; what he thinks of the other part of the Creed is not amiss, but to say that it was never questioned amongst Christians (except by the *Arrians*) that Christ was God Eternal is an huge mistake. Before *Arrius* appear'd, several *Hereticks* denied it, and *Arrius* according to this word *ὁμοούσιος*, as appears by his Letters and Confession would not scruple to call Christ

Christ  
He  
made  
quer  
any  
he w  
form  
of th  
to th  
reaso  
son t  
trary  
ing  
was  
Aur  
very  
ceiv  
Per  
God

Christ the Eternal God.

He adds, *That no man can be made an Heretick by consequence this shall not create any dispute but what means he when he saith because that form was not put into the body of the Creed, but directed onely to the Bishops, there was no reason to punish any Lay-person that should speak to the contrary; I cant find his meaning: for the form* *ὁμο ὕψις* *was in the Creed, and by the Authority of that Council every person who did not receive it was anathematiz'd.* Perhaps he means this, that *God hath no Parts* is not in the

G

form

form of the Creed. This is acknowledged, that the Council did not put that in to the forme of the Creed, yet it was determined by the Council. The Letters which *Eusebius* wrote were *Synodical*.

By the superscriptions it appears, that the Contents of those Epistles did not concerne onely the Bishop, but all the People. *Socrates, Lib. 1. Cap. 5.* gives a full account of this; he wrote an Epistle of the *Decrees* and *Acts* of which *Eusebius* sent by order of the Council. *αἰς τῶς παλαστῖνης καὶ οὐβῆται,* and this



this same Epistle saith So-  
*crates Eusebius* sent τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ  
 Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, to the Church  
 of *Alexandria*, to those of  
*Lybia, Egypt and Pentapolis*.  
 What the *synod* by a com-  
 mon suffrage past, when the  
 conciliary decrees were sent  
 to all the Churches: Mr.  
*Hobs* would make the World  
 believe that they being di-  
 rected by the Bishops were  
 onely obligatory of them.  
 The Contrary in *Theodore*.  
*Lib. 1. Cap. 5. Cap. 12.* The  
 Synodical Epistles of the *Ni-  
 cene* Fathers were directed  
 not to the Bishops, for the Bi-  
 shops were present in Coun-

cib but to the Church of *Alexandria*, and to all our be-  
 loved brethren in *Egypt*, *Libi-*  
*a* and *Pentapolis*. These being  
 thus directed there was no  
 reason to punish any Lay-  
 person which should speak  
 to the contrary. But what  
 was the meaning of this  
 Doctrine, that God hath no  
 parts? Was it made Heresy  
 to say that God who is a re-  
 al Substance, cannot be con-  
 sidered or spoken of as here  
 or there, or any where  
 which are parts of places?  
 Or that there is any real  
 thing without length every-  
 way, that is to say which  
 hath

ha  
 ni  
 an  
 ju  
 itw  
 are  
 wh  
 co  
 Te  
 fu  
 re  
 wh  
 rea  
 taf  
 Ho  
 No  
 is t  
 Go  
 ed T  
 vera

hath no magnitude at all Finite or Infinite? Or is there any whole Substance, whose two halves or three thirds are not the same with that whole? Or did they mean to condemn the Argument of *Tertullian*, by which he confuted *Apelles* and other Hereticks of his times: namely whatsoever was not corporeal, was nothing but phantasm, and not Corporeal for Heretical? no certainly. No Divines say that, What is the meaning of this, that God hath no Parts?

To explain this he adds several questions, whether God

considered or spoken of, as here and there, or that there is any real thing without length every way. i. e. hath magnitude at all Finite or Infinite: 'tis returned to those questions. God is an Infinite substance without magnitude; nor can it be said, that a magnitude is infinite, 'tis impossible to think that to be infinite, to which there can be an addition. His third capricious question is frivolous; 'Tis true if that substance be material, but it is not true in an immaterial substance. To the Fourth let any Divine be produced who saith that what

-noo

ε

is

is no  
This  
ther  
real S  
Epicu  
Philo  
whol  
must  
times  
mean  
ever  
this i  
to be  
Thus  
Tertu  
Lib.  
Anim  
est pas  
gustin

is not *Corporeal* is a *Phantasmie*.  
This is the question, whether all beings which have a real *Substance* be *Corporeals*, the *Epicureans* affirme it, other Philosophers and Christians wholly deny it; indeed it must be affirmed, that sometimes by *Corpus* or a *Body* is meant any real being, or whatever hath any real being; and this it is by some conceived to be the sence of *Tertullian*. Thus *St. Augustine* vindicates *Tertullian* *de Genesi ad Literam* Lib. 10. Cap. ult. *Tertull. de Animâ* Cap. 7 *Omne Corporale est passibile*. Upon that *St. Augustine*, debuit ergo mutare senti-

*tentiam.* He ought therefore to change his opinion which he mentions in another place. God is a body. *ad vernis Praxeam.* I cannot believe that he was so childish as to believe the Nature of God is *passibile* but that by this Argument, whatsoever was not *Corporeal* was nothing, should be the argument whereby he confuted *Apelles*, and other Hereticks in his times is a Conclusion above the reach of my understanding. He disputes against *Hermogenes* who asserted an Eternal matter co-existent with God, who one

of the  
What  
against  
from y  
est Co  
thing  
Tertul  
he tal  
Herm  
himse  
videt  
first f  
incor  
rious  
saith  
neith  
porea  
stanc  
the S  
at T  
of

of that created this Universe.  
What Argument can be used  
against *Hermogines* taken  
from proposition, *Omne quod  
est Corpus est*. There is no-  
thing but Body. In Cap. 35.  
*Tertullian* explains himself;  
he takes an Argument from  
*Hermogines* his contradicting  
himself, *primâ facie materia  
videtur esse incorporealis*; at the  
first sight matter seems to be  
incorporeal: but having se-  
riously pondered what he  
saith, Matter will be found  
neither Corporeal, nor Incor-  
poreal. That I grant, some sub-  
stance is onely Incorporeal, for  
the Substance it self is the Bo-  
dy

dy of every thing when *Corporeal* and *Incorporeal* are mentioned; nothing else will be admitted. Thus he explaining his sence of *Corpus* that it is *Substantia*, he confuted *Hermogenes* not from the recited proposition, but his own contrarietys; the same may be applyed to what he disputes against *Marchiean Apelles* and *Praxeas*. Therefore against Mr. *Hobs* I may be confident to averr that *Tertullian* never attempts the refuting *Apelles*, or any other Heretick in his time, from this Topick, whatsoever was not *Corporeal* was a *Phantasme*.

Tis t  
went  
dual G  
bolish  
in Go  
that  
destro  
and t  
in exp  
say, t  
dersto  
in no  
sence  
conce  
Coun  
judge  
be In  
real,  
Tis



Tis true the *Nicene* Fathers went to establish one *Individual* God in Trinity, to abolish the diversity of *species* in God: and tis not true, that they did not intend to destroy the distinction of *here* and *there*, for the Council in explaining the word did say, that it could not be understood of God, καὶ ἀμφοτέρωθεν not καὶ παρ᾽ ἑνὸς, for the Essence of God was αὐτὸ καὶ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ, the discourse is not concerning the intent of the Council. Since the Council judged the nature of God to be Immaterial and Incorporeal, they did conclude that  
an

an Incorporeal Substance was the  
 not a contradiction; there-  
 fore the holy Fathers must  
 needs have thought that God  
 had no extended parts; nor  
 any sort of parts; and there-  
 fore not be considered as being  
 and there. What a force is done  
 by him to the Apostles ques-  
 tion; St. Paul asks the Cor-  
 inthians, *Is Christ divided?* which  
 he thus interprets. "He did  
 not think, they thought  
 him impossible to be con-  
 sidered as having hands and  
 feet, but that they might  
 think him (alluding to the  
 manner of the Gentiles), one  
 of the sons of God, but not  
 the

the only begotten. Thus expounded in *Athanasius* his Creed, *Not Confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance, i.e.* God is not divided into 3 Persons *Peter, James and John*, nor are the 3 Persons one and the same Person. Tis granted, that the Fathers intended the last, but it is denied that they had any such intent, by not dividing the substance, to have a respect unto various Individuals, for in that division, the Persons & substances are divided, the Substances are different and not the same; but in the persons of the In-

H

divi.

dividual Trinity, the Substance is the same. And in created beings the *Persona* of every Individual is really distinct, not onely from the essence and person of another Individual, but from the Substance in which it doth subsist; which appears in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, who assumed not the Person but Nature of Man: but the mystery being great above all the understanding and apprehension of man; it is rather the object of Faith, than Reason. My main undertaking against Mr. *Hobs* in this

this  
or  
to  
clea  
trad  
atte  
into  
whi  
his  
and  
the  
lat  
cal  
div  
an  
sag  
int

this Tract is not to illustrate or prove the meaning, but to manifest that he has not cleared himself of the contradiction, and that in his attempts he throws himself into new absurdities, one of which is this *Paragraph*.

But *Aristotle*, and from him all the *Greek* Fathers, and other learned men, when they distinguish the general latitude of a word, they call it *division*, as when they divide the *Animal* into *Man* and *Beast*, they call these *Species*, and when they again divide the *Species* *Man* into *Peter* and *John*, they

'call these *res partes indivi-*  
 'duae. And by this confound-  
 'ing the division of the Sub-  
 'stance with the distinction of  
 'words, divers men have been  
 'led into Error of attribut-  
 'ing to God a name, which  
 'is not the name of any Sub-  
 'stance at all, viz. *Incorporea*.  
 'Tis true that the Philoso-  
 'phers, when they divide *Ma-*  
 '*nima* or the Genus into *Ma-*  
 'or *Beasts*, they call these *res*  
 '*species*, but when they again  
 'divide the *species Man*, into  
 '*Peter* and *John*, they never call  
 'these *res partes Individua*, for  
 '*res* are *partes dividuae*, there-  
 'fore *Individua* are called

"Am  
 is in  
 when  
 is a  
 corp  
 were  
 obse  
 fom  
 Cor  
 nee  
 sen  
 by  
 but  
 into  
 Err  
 vifi  
 dis  
 thi  
 ny

"Amra ; but what sence there is in his deduction, I'll give, when I understand it. There is a substance, which is Incorporeal ; the Philosophers were led into that truth by observing the operations of some beings which are not Corporeal, where it must needs follow, that these essences are Incorporeal ; and by some other Arguments : but that they should be led into this, which he calls an Error by confounding the division of Substance with the distinction of words, is a thing far from Truth, and any conception of mine.

' Many Heresies which ' selves  
 ' were Antecedent to the first deed  
 ' general Council were con-tribut  
 ' demned, as that of *Manes* (he but th  
 ' might have added *Marcion*) Chur  
 ' by the first article *I believe* other  
*in one God.* This was not di- that  
 rected onely against them, why  
 but also against the *polythe- berty*  
*isme* of the Heathens, 'tho to in th  
 ' me it seems still to remain is to  
 ' in the Doctrine of the rine-c  
 ' Church of *Rome*, which so of *E*  
 attributes a liberty of the Chur  
 ' will to men, as that their Devi  
 ' will and purpose to commit to sin  
 ' sin not should proceed from of sin  
 ' the cause of all things God, om is  
 ' but originally from them- ing r  
 ' selves



themselves or from the Devil. Indeed *Marcion* and *Manes* attributed Sin to an evill God, but the Church of *Rome*, the Church of *England*, and all other Churches look upon that Opinion as Heretical: why this Doctrine of the Liberty of the will is to remain in the Church of *Rome*, this is to palliate. This Doctrine continues in the Church of *England*, and in all the Churches of Christ. The Devil does vehemently tempt to sin, but he is not the cause of sin; hence that good *Axiom* is received by all knowing men, *No body is injured but*

but by himself, that which properly an Evil is the Effect of Sin, which our selves only can inflict upon us; but how comes it to pass that the Doctrine of the Liberty of the Will should be opposed by this Article, *I believe in one God?* they who maintain that Doctrine firmly believe this Article, They say that the one true God is infinitely glorious in all perfections amongst which is the Liberty of his will, he created all things, amongst which he created Rational beings which he endowed with the Liberty of Will, whereby they are

made

made capable of being ver-  
tuous, and so to be rewarded,  
or vicious, and so to be pun-  
ished; where is there by this  
sentiment a setting up ano-  
ther God? by God he means  
one first Cause which necessa-  
rily moved from all eternity,  
from which necessary cause  
there flows an infinite con-  
catenation of necessary cau-  
ses, whence if any say, that  
there is a Liberty of the Will,  
he must assigne another first  
Cause, and from thence op-  
pose this Article *I believe in one*  
*God*; we say there is but one  
first Cause, and that a free A-  
gent, whence springs the Li-  
berty.

berty of Rational Beings. By the account which Mr. Hobbes gives of God, and by several of his opinions it must be concluded, that he believed there is no God. One of his sayings is, *He that saith there is no mind in the World, hath no mind.* This is a gingling quibble, besides many gross absurdities with which his opinion is charged, this is no mean one. *God is the Author of Sin*; which he replies *Leviath. cap. 46.* by this distinction *God is not the Author of Sin, but he is the cause.* The Author is he who commands, the Cause by whose Power a thing is done.

one. This with many other distinctions he frames, which are more subtile, perplext, and remote from sence, then any of the School mens, for which he so much condemns them. Certainly every cause the Author of a thing. He that commands, is by that a moral cause. But he that is a cause by enabling to do, is a physical cause of Sin. God can't be such a cause; but it may be queried whether God, according to Mr. Hobs, ever gave any laws to man kind, for unquestionably: if the rule of Justice, & Injustice Good and Bad, true and false be the will of  
of

of the supream power: God never gave laws to man kind: perhaps (saith he) the *Anthropomorphites* were the condemned, but this cannot be, for they appeared not until the time of *Valens*. This is no great matter. It is certain that the Council did condemn all those who ascribed any parts to God, which the *Anthropomorphites* did, yet *Epiphanius* be credited, *heret.* 70. *Ardianus* a *Mesopotamian* can the Author of this *Heresy* of the *Anthropomorphites* flourish in the time of *Arrianus*, when the *Nicene Council* was convened.

No  
ordain  
Dep  
ment  
of B  
refus  
Fait  
(wh  
of a  
crim  
law  
onel  
Chu  
in a  
How  
Parap  
Chur  
a Cri  
of an

No

No other punishment was  
ordained by *Constantine* than  
Deprivation and Banish-  
ment; and that not onely  
of *Bishops* and *Pastors* who  
refused to subscribe to the  
Faith; thus did Heresie  
(which at first was the name  
of a private opinion, and no  
crime, was by vertue of a  
law of the Emperor, made  
onely for the Peace of the  
Church) become a Crime  
in a Pastor and punishable.  
How many *Errata's* in this  
Paraptaph? Heresy in the  
Church of Christ was always  
a Crime, and never the name  
of an opinion. This I prov'd  
No I be-

before; let it be granted, that every Sin is not a Crime, and that every Crime is that which is punishable; 'tis a trifle to be religious in words, every Sin is certainly punishable; some Sins are greater than others, so there is a difference in Crimes, there are Crimes which are onely discernable by Almighty God; and punishable at his tribunal; but that Heresy should be a Crime onely because the civil power inflicts a corporal punishment, cannot be understood by any, but such a person, who bids a defiance not only to the Christian

R

Relig  
Relig  
ture  
clude  
doth  
life  
meth  
after  
cil  
punish  
Pastor  
or no  
In th  
were  
they  
in b  
curio  
miser  
which



Religion, but to all other Religions which assert a future retribution, or concludes that the great God doth punish evil men in this life by some extraordinary methods. But that Heresy after this decree of the council became onely a Crime punishable in the *Bishops* and *Pastors*, whether it be true or not, is not much material. In the *Pastors* the People were always punished, for they followed their *Pastors* in banishment. *Basil* with a curious pen delineating the miserys and calamitys under which the *Orthodox* Bishops

and Pastors groan'd, likewise gives us the description of those dreadful sufferings, with which the people were oppress'd.

*Eusebius* giving us an account of an Edict of *Constantine* against Hereticks, in that not onely Bishops and Pastors, but all sorts of Hereticks were involved. *de vit. Constant. lib. 3 cap. 62.* And having proved before that *Arianisme* was decreed an Heresy not for the peace of the Church, but likewise that there might be an agreement in the same faith, which was necessary to salvation, we may

may justly say that every line  
of that Paragraph is notori-  
ously untrue. To lessen the  
Esteem of the *Nicene* and the  
4 General Councils, says he,  
There arose new Heresies a-  
bout the Interpretation of  
the Creed, and partly a-  
bout the Holy Ghost, of  
which the *Nicene* Coun-  
cil had not determined,  
And afterwards concer-  
ning the Holy Ghost. *Nest-*  
*orius* Bishop of *Constantinople*  
& some others denied the di-  
vinity thereof. The *Pneuma-*  
*tomachi* appearing after the  
Council of *Nice* had preten-

ded for themselves the silence of the *Nicene* Fathers, to which *Basil*; *Naxianzen*; *Theoderet*; *Epiphanius* answered, there being no question moved concerning it, the Council acquiesced in the opinion, and right Faith of the Universal Church, concerning the Divinity of the Holy-Ghost.

Why should the Fathers confirme that truth which was not questioned, but taken for granted, or condemne that for Heresy which was not preached, yet if not in a set forme of words decreed, yet

yet  
conf  
Fath  
give  
78.  
here  
fwer  
nius  
thus  
whi  
and  
give  
for  
in C  
the  
Holy  
Fai  
Son

yet in truth and by good  
consequence, the sence of the  
Fathers as to that Article was  
given. For St. *Basil Epist.*  
*78. Hieronim. Epist. 65. Epipha-*  
*haresti 74* take off, and an-  
swer that objection; *Epipha-*  
*nus* and *Athanasius* prove it  
thus, that the same glory  
which is given to the Father,  
and to the Son, is likewise  
given to the Holy Ghost;  
for the Symbol is, *I believe*  
*in God the Father, and in God*  
*the Son; and I believe in the*  
*Holy Ghost.* This Divine  
Faith, fixed upon the Father,  
Son, and holy Ghost, as one  
and

and the same God, gives the true sense of the Council.

The great mistake concerning Nestorius must only be attributed to Mr. Hobbs his animadversion: for it was not Nestorius, but Macedonius who denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. Nestorius was a great adversary to the *τρίτατος υἱος*, therefore in Socrates Lib. 7. Cap. 31. we find that Nestorius was so great an Enemy to the Macedonians that when he was Bishop of Constantinople he drove the Macedonians out of all their Churches in that City, and in the Hellespont.

Con-

Concerning the Parts  
established there arose dis-  
putes about the Nature of  
Christ, and the word *Hypo-*  
*stasis*. (i. e.) Substance.  
for of persons there was yet  
no mention made in their  
Creed being written in  
Greek, in which Language  
there is no word that an-  
swereth to the Latine word  
*Persona*; and the Union, as  
the Fathers called it, of the  
Humane and Divine Nature  
in Christ *Hypostolical* caused  
*Eutyches*, and after him *Dios-*  
*curus* to affirme there was  
but one Nature in Christ,  
think

'thinking that whensoever  
'two things are united, they  
'are one.

Tis true the Latine word  
*Persona* is used in the Latine  
Church, which Church em-  
braced likewise the word  
*Hypostasis*, and all differen-  
ces concerning those words  
were within a while com-  
posed, and all Orthodox  
Christians in that Church  
who know the Greek Lan-  
guage do receive the word  
*Hypostasis* in the same sense  
which the Latines use *Per-  
sona*. The famous Nicene  
Councils having decreed, that  
there were two Natures in  
Christ

Chri  
whic  
exac  
tine  
shop  
this  
ther  
sons  
ther  
20: i  
gain  
lent  
Act  
Conj  
clin  
oth  
the  
Ch  
tur



Christ, and one *Hypostasis* which signifies *Subsistence*, this exactly answers to the Latine *Persona*. Nestorius Bishop of Constantine brocht this Heresy that in Christ there were two distinct persons, and so Mary the Mother of Christ was not ~~only~~ the Mother of God: against him Eutyches excellently disputed in the Fourth Aetion, in the Council of Constantinople; Eutyches declining the one, fell into another Heresy, asserting that there was but one Nature in Christ, yet the humane Nature was swallowed up by the Divine.

Divine, and was not of the  
 flesh of the Virgin, but de-  
 scended from God. A great  
 promoter of this impiety was  
*Dioscurus* Bishop of *Alexan-*  
*dria*, a wicked and lewd  
 person, a Monster rather  
 than a Bishop. These were  
 condemned in the *Chalcedoni-*  
*an Council*. I will grant that  
 the Disciples of *Eutyches* did  
 say, *If two Natures there would*  
*be two hypostases*, I will say it  
 was an Heretical illation, and  
 affirme, that the Latine  
 word *Persona* answers to the  
 Greek *ὑπόστασις*, according to  
 the Sence of the Churches  
 both *East* and *West*. *ὑπόστασις*

is no  
 ences to  
 answ  
 Nicene  
 tion o  
 tical B  
 nor fr  
 But th  
 by the  
 cil, of  
 which  
 after  
 the fe  
 all ag  
 and th  
 as Pe  
 the un  
 nifyin  
 but S  
 Nicen

is

is not *Substantie* but *Subsistence* to which *Persona* directly answers. But (saith he) in the *Nicene Creed* there's no mention of *Hypostasis* or *Hypostatical Union*; nor of Corporeal, nor Incorporeal, nor of parts; But this was acknowledged by the Fathers in that Council, there was the *quod est* which necessarily infers it: after a dispute concerning the sense of these words, they all agreed in the same Faith, and that *Hypostasis* is as well as *Persona*, entertained by the universal Church; not signifying *Substantiam* as usually; but *Subsistentiam*; from the *Nicene* decree must of ne-

cessity flow the *Hypostatical Union*. Tho the word *Incorporeal* was not used in the *Nicean Creed*, yet it is used in *Eusebius* his *Synodical Epistles*, who styles God  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\alpha\iota\omicron\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ , *Immaterial* and *Incorporeal*, as before asserted: but invidiously to throw dirt upon the Fathers: such Points (saith he) were not necessary to Salvation, but set a broad way for ostentation of learning, or else to dazle men with deep signe to lead them toward some ends of their own. By which he charges the most humble persons with pride, the most sincere with Hypocrisis.

crisis  
with  
that  
cessar  
vulga  
whar  
inten  
Cour  
by A  
See;  
and  
Wes  
ter r  
thes  
this  
was  
really  
Arti  
& ne

crisie, and the most unbiass'd  
with secular aims. Tis true  
that it was not judged ne-  
cessary to Salvation, that  
vulgar persons should know  
what *Hypostasis* and *Persona*  
intended, as appears by that  
Council held at *Alexandria*  
by *Athanasius* Bishop of that  
See; *Eusebius* of *Vercelles*,  
and *Lucifer* of *Calaris*. Two  
Western Bishops, who af-  
ter they had contended about  
these words, were united in  
this *Nicene* article, that *Christ*  
was the *Eternal Son of God*, and  
really *God*, and that it was an  
Article of the *Christian Faith*,  
& necessary to *Salvation*. What

he says, concerning Sir Sympson is nothing to my designe nor shall I make any remarks upon his discourse of the Usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, I do take cognizance of what he says of the punishment obtained against Hereticks in the Reign of K. Richard the 2. and succeeding Princes, for this is nothing to my purpose & my whole designe is to make good the contradiction with which he is charged. I must therefore have no regard to any penal statutes in Causes Ecclesiastical, until the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. I charge him with

these  
contr  
the C  
whom  
laws  
ject.  
a. T  
same  
ther.  
the sa  
rall;  
Heret  
Churc  
Hobs  
last  
by  
Doct  
the C  
it in t

these heretical propositions,  
contrary to the doctrine of  
the Church of *England*, to  
whom he is obliged by the  
laws of the King to be Sub-  
ject. 1. That God hath parts.  
2. That Christ is not of the  
same Substance with the Fa-  
ther. 3. That the Persons in  
the sacred Trinity are tempo-  
rall; All which are declared  
Heretical by the lawes, and  
Church of *England*. But Mr.  
*Hobs* would evade the two  
last Heretical propositions  
by saying he believes the  
Doctrine of the Trinity as  
the Church hath explained  
it in the Catechisme. When  
the

the Minister asks the Catechumene, what dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy Belief? He answers, I learn first to believe in God the Father, who created me and all the World. 2. In God the Son who hath redeemed me and all Mankind. 3. In God the Holy-Ghost who hath Sanctified me and all the Elect People of God. What is there intended but this, that God in his own person did create all things, in the Person of his Son did redeem Mankind, in the person of the Holy Ghost did Sanctify the Church: What clearer concerning the Divine per-

sons

Sons  
ous  
Appe  
On  
nour  
obsc  
to th  
perl  
nas  
it m  
fame  
sign  
vari  
gre  
Com  
gre  
an  
the  
Sch



of Heresie.

101

sons, or more consentaneous to the Faith can be said?

*Appendix ad Leviath. Cap. 1.*

On the contrary I will pronounce that nothing is more obscure nor distantaneous to the Faith: Tully said properly, *Ego tres sustineo personas, mei Iudicis adversarij*, yet it must be granted, that the same word may have divers significations, peculiarly in various sciences, else the great and famous Northern Constellations may note the greatest Bear in the Muscovian Snowes. The Latine Fathers, and after them the Schools, and Divines, take  
not

not the word *Persona* in the same sence that Orators and Philosophers do. I believe that *Bellarmino* did know the meaning of the Latine word *persona* as well as Mr. *Hobbes*. Let common sence be appealed, can the Mystery of the Trinity be explained according to *Cicero's* use of the word *Persona*. For according to the Church of England in the *Athanasian Creed*, which is part of the Liturgy established by Law, and ratified in the 8 Article, in which are these words, *the Three Creeds, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and that*

common-

common  
Creed,  
derived  
Athanasian  
not only  
of the  
the  
and  
but  
the P  
(i.e.)  
when  
A. S.  
Mank  
when  
abso  
Faith  
ous a  
Perfo

commonly called the Apostles Creed, ought to be thoroughly received and believed. In the Athanasian, the Eternity is not onely of the Essence, but of the Persons, not as the Father Eternal, the Son Eternal, and the Holy Ghost Eternal, but according to Mr. Hobbs the Persons were Temporal (i. e.) God became a Father, when he created the World, A Son when he redeemed Mankind, and the Holy Ghost when he Sanctifies; which is absolutely contrary to the Faith: for upon the Impious account of Mr. Hobbs the Persons were not eternal, by rea-

reason the Actions of God in creating the World, by which there was the personality of the Father, and of the Son in redeeming the World, and of the Holy Ghost in Sanctifying the Elect People of God, were temporal. Let this be Queried, What Sence is this? God redeemed Mankind in the person of his Son, *Persona mei* is *Tully* himself, but *Persona Judicis* is *Tully* representing a Judge, did God represent another in the redeeming of the World? This leads to the making good this Heresy concerning the Incarnation

of the  
utterly  
liation  
being  
eterna  
gotten  
time  
expre  
the S  
to be  
God  
fore  
is sai  
mean  
of G  
of th  
Mat  
was  
ry m

of the Son of God, for he utterly denies the eternal *Filiation*, and saith, that Christ being the Son of God was an eternal God, but as being begotten extraordinarily in time he acknowledgeth that expressly and frequently in the Scriptures Christ is said to be begotten; that he was God born of the Father before the World; when Christ is said to be begotten, tis meant, that he was begotten of God himself, the Father of the Matter of the Virgin, *Mat. 1. vers. 20. that which was begotten of the Virgin Mary was of the Holy Ghost, and should*

should be called the Son of God.

But some perhaps will say  
that the eternal generation  
differs from that which was  
made in the Womb of the  
Virgin.

To which he thus answers,  
where doth the Holy Scrip-  
ture or Synod thus distin-  
guish? this Question is a cer-  
tain demonstration that he  
denys the eternal generation  
and that he by a strange pas-  
sion resolves to deny those  
things which for certain he  
knows to be true, if a stout  
denyal serves his designe.  
The sacred Scripture in sever-  
al places is expresse for the

iter-

etern  
it di  
The  
and  
them  
the p  
of G  
the  
cern  
tion  
liry.

H  
his  
tain  
It re  
Her  
I sta  
sue

eternal generation, makeing it distant from the temporal. The scriptures were wrested and false Glosses put upon them; *Arrius* did not deny the præexistence of the Son of God, who was Incarnate, the difference was not concerning the Eternal Generation, but the Consubstantiality.

Having thus proved, that his *Leviathan* contains certain Hæretical propositions; It remains, that I prove these Heresies Criminal, and thus I state the Question and pursue it.

L

Tis

'Tis one of Mr. Hobbs great Artifices to avoid those absurdities into which his own sentiments casts him. Mr. Hobbs percieving that he is justly charg'd with this imputation, writes the book call'd *The Historical Narrative of Heresie*. The Parliament complain'd, That in it were contain'd several Heretical Opinions, (*i. e.*) Opinions declared Heresie by the Church and Laws of *England*: he being a Subject to the King, is obliged to obedience to the Laws of his Sovereign. By this therefore he

he do  
himse  
his g  
cal  
' Jus  
' ma  
' not  
' wh  
F  
char  
viat  
tem  
be p  
doth  
nion  
Tha  
opp  
tha  
by t



he doth manifestly contradict himself, and opposeth these his great Moral and Political *Postulata's*. Nothing is 'Just or Unjust, but what is 'made so by Law, and that 'nothing is Criminal, but 'what a Penal Law prohibits.

From this his most just charge he would free his *Leviathan*; to shew that his attempts are frivolous, it must be prov'd, that his *Leviathan* doth contain Heretical Opinions. To which he returns, That there is no opinion that opposeth a Penal Statute; or that no Person can be justly by the Civil Magistrate pu-

nish'd for any Opinion con-  
 tain'd in the *Leviathan*. For  
 (saith he) ' All the Penal  
 ' Laws against *Hereticks* were  
 ' repeal'd in the Reign of  
 ' Q. *Elizabeth*. To remedy  
 ' the Inconvenience which  
 ' might arise by Novel Dog-  
 ' ma's, She apointed a Court,  
 ' call'd the *High Commission*,  
 ' to declare what was *Heresie*.  
 ' But that *High Commission* ne-  
 ' ver declared what was *He-*  
 ' *resie*, or if they did, it was  
 ' to no purpose, for they were  
 ' not impower'd to inflict a-  
 ' ny punishment upon an *He-*  
 ' *retick*. Withal the Parlia-  
 ' ment abolishing that Court,

no.

noth  
 Here  
 than  
 when  
 or Pr  
 ters  
 supp  
 by thi  
 Leviat  
 to jud  
 punish  
 estrat  
 ny, I v  
 The M  
 Myste  
 Trinity  
 and In  
 Blasph  
 parts,

nothing could be accounted  
*Heresie*: Besides the *Levia-*  
*than* was Printed in 1651.  
when it was lawful to Write  
or Preach any thing in mat-  
ters of Religion. To which  
suppose that some, nay ma-  
ny things contained in the  
*Leviathan* are *Heretical*, and  
so judged by the Church, and  
punishable by the Civil Ma-  
istrate. Not to mention ma-  
ny, I will assign these Two.  
The Nature of *God*, and the  
Mystery of the Individual  
*Trinity* are by him *Heretically*  
and *Impiously* explicated. He  
Blasphemously avers *God hath*  
*parts*, and makes the Persons

of the Holy Trinity to be  
 Temporal, not Eternal; both  
 which are declared Heretical  
 by the first Article,) and by  
 the three Creeds. The *Athanasian Creed* is imbodyed  
 into the Common Law, and  
 that his opinion concerning  
 the Trinity is Heretical is in-  
 dubitable; waving the Con-  
 tests he strives violently to  
 maintain, that Nothing in mat-  
 ters of Faith is declared Cri-  
 minal by the Law, or punish-  
 able by the Civil Magistrate.  
 For saith he the Lady *Eliza-  
 beth* in her first year repeale  
 all the Laws Ecclesiastical of  
 Queen *Mary*, and all other

Law

• Laws concerning the pun-  
• ishing of Hereticks, nor  
• did She enact any other pun-  
• ishment in their place. These  
lines he could not deliver  
without that same arrogance  
by which he explodes the U-  
niversityes, and accounts  
most of the Learned men in  
the World, Fools. For the  
Writs *de Heretico Comburendo*  
and *de excommunicato capiendo*  
were in force, he adds in the  
2 place, it was enacted • That  
• the Queen by her Letters  
• Patents should give a Com-  
• mission to the Bishops with  
• severall other Persons in her  
• Majesties name to execute  
his

' his Power ecclesiastical, this  
 ' is granted, ( he proceeds )  
 ' In which *Commission* the  
 ' Commissioners were for-  
 ' bidden to adjudge any thing  
 ' to be *Heresy* which was not  
 ' declared to be *Heresy* by  
 ' some of the four first Gene-  
 ' ral Concils, nor was there  
 ' any thing in that Commis-  
 ' sion concerning how Here-  
 ' ticks ought to be punished.  
 ' But it was granted to them  
 ' to declare, or not declare to  
 ' be *Heresy* or not *Heresy* as  
 ' they pleased, any of those  
 ' Doctrines which had been  
 ' condemned in the four first  
 ' general Councils for *Her-*

*sie.*  
 .  
 .  
 .

*sie.* T  
 he sub  
 hat I  
 Statute  
 (mean  
 mission  
 or Pe  
 mine  
 or ca  
 only  
 have  
 dere  
 Here  
 the  
 or b  
 Cou  
 or  
 Cou  
 was

ie. To refute this, and what  
he subjoyns, tis requisite  
that I give the words of the  
Statute. 'They shall not  
(meaning the *High Com-  
missioners*) have Authority  
or Power to order deter-  
mine or adjudge any matter  
or cause to be *Heresy*, but  
only such as heretofore  
have been determined, or-  
dered or adjudged to be  
*Heresy* by the Authority of  
the Canonical Scriptures,  
or by the first four general  
Councils, or any of them,  
or by any other General  
Council, wherein the same  
was declared *Heresy* by the  
ex-

'express and plain words  
 'of the said Canonical  
 'Scriptures, or such as here  
 'after shall be ordered, deter-  
 'mined or adjudged to be  
 'Heresy by the High Court of  
 'Parliament of this Realme  
 'with the assent of the Cler-  
 'gy in their Convocation. By  
 this it appears what a lame  
 and false account he gives of  
 the Statute, for the Queen  
 and her Parliament did not  
 leave it indifferent to the  
*High Commission* to determine  
 what was or what was not  
*Heresy*, but limits them (to  
 declare what was *Heresy* or  
 not *Heresy*) not only to the

four

four first  
 he seem  
 but lik  
 words  
 the Pa  
 seems  
 mits th  
 Nor  
 that  
 conc  
 ough  
 High C  
 flict  
 hope  
 there  
 capit  
 missio  
 perso  
 vide  
 Engl



four first general Councils (as he seems falsely to insinuate) but likewise to the express words of Scripture, and to the Parliament; which he seems to exclude, for he omits the mentioning of them; Nor was there (he adds) in that *Commission* any thing concerning how *Hereticks* ought to be punished. The *High Commission* could not inflict capital punishment. I hope Mr *Hobs* will not say there is no crime, but twas capitall. That the *High Commission* had power to punish persons in case of *Heresy* is evident both by the Law of *England*, and practice of that Court

Court. By the Law of England expressly by the Act Elizabeth. that Court was Invested with all Ecclesiastical power before the Cancelling of the High-Commisson, the Bishop had a Power to Imprison persons, and the Writ *de excommunicato capiendo* still continues. The words of the Act are that the Queen or any of her Successors should nominate one or more persons to use, exercise and occupy, all manner of jurisdictions, priviledges or preeminences in any wise touching, or concerning any spiritual or Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to visit reforme

reformation  
rectors  
rulers  
&c.  
for a  
the E  
rect  
amen  
if the  
not c  
Here  
Invest  
accom  
they  
not  
return  
was  
that  
punish  
muni

reforme, redress, order, correct and amend all such Errors, Heresies, Schismes &c. It was perfect nonsense for a Parliament to enable the English Sovereign to erect a Court to punish and amend Errors and *Heresies*, if the Law of *England* had not declared what was an *Heresy*, and likewise not to Invest them with power to accomplish such ends, which they had not, if they could not inflict punishments, he returned, 'The jurisdiction was onely spiritual: but to that was annexed a civil punishment. Upon excommunication there lay a Writ

*de excommunicato capiendis*; that a Person excommunicated for *Heresy* or Errors in Doctrine, by that Writ might be Imprisoned, is clear as the day. Certainly imprisonment is a civil Punishment. This Writ lay against those who were obstinate Offenders in Causes Ecclesiastical is evident by 5 *Elix. Cap. 23* with the *significavit* to be added to the Writ, and in that *significavit* 'tis joyn'd that the Excommunication doth proceed upon some cause of some Original matter of *Heresy*, or Error in Religion or Doctrine, now received and allowed in the said Church of

*Eng.*

*Eng.*  
that  
mig  
*Her*  
For  
the  
Con  
ther  
*com*  
dec  
the  
suc  
clea  
wh  
tec  
ma  
eid  
if i  
wa

England, whereby it appears  
that Persons for Heresie  
might be Imprisoned, and so  
Heresie to become Criminal.  
For it was to be punished by  
the civil Magistrate with  
Corporal Mulcts; and far-  
ther lay a Writ de Heretico  
comburendo; if nothing was  
declared Heresie, why did  
they lye such a Writ. That  
such a Writ was in force, is  
clear by the annulling of it,  
when this fatal Plot was de-  
tected, then the Parliament  
made an Act to Cancel it;  
whether it was in force, or not;  
if in force, the Parliament  
was Prudent in making it

Void, if not it casts a reproach upon the Two Houses to annul that which was exploded. That these Writs were in force is declared, and that the Writ *de excommunicato capiendo* retains its Vigor, is evinc'd by the usage of the Kingdome of *England*. As for the Writ *de Heretico comburendo*, it was put in execution in King *James* his time. *Legat* & *Wightman* were Burnt, the one in *Smith-field*, and the other in *Litchfield*, for the *Arrian Heresy*. He saith, that they which approve such executions may peradventure know better grounds for

for t  
groun  
thy to  
he m  
the j  
He t  
the S  
just  
that  
Eng  
tico  
ther  
lega  
Coo  
tha  
mo  
his  
ren  
be

for them then I do. But grounds are very well worthy to be enquired after: but he might very well know the just grounds for them. He that affirms the Law to be the Sole rule of just and unjust could not be ignorant that by the common Law of England, the *Writ de Heretico comburendo* was valid, and thereupon an *Heretick* might legally be Burnt. My Lord Cook part 3. cap. 5. affirms that by the Books of the common Law the King Issuing out his *Writ de Heretico comburendo*, an *Heretick* ought to be Burnt. That *Heresy* might

be punished by Corporeal and pecuniary Mulcts, is clear by the Queens Letters Patents, authorized by the Statute of her Reign. She did give to the Arch Bishop of Cant. the Bishop of London, and divers others, any Three or more of them, full Power and Authority to reforme, redress, order, correct, and amend &c. and to have full Power and Authority to order and award, to every such offender by Fine, Imprisonment, Censure of the Church, or otherways, or all or any of the said ways. *Camdrys Case.* and

in

in that  
ved by  
Statu  
*Eliza*  
any  
an a  
of th  
resto  
Anci  
Stat  
ritua  
the  
Chu  
tho  
oug  
fiast  
cee  
mo  
all



in that same case it is resolved by the Judges, that the Statute of the First of Queen *Elizabeth* did not introduce any new Law, but declared an ancient one. The Title of the Statute being an Act restoring to the Crown the Ancient jurisdiction over the State Ecclesiastical and Spiritual. The Sovereign, being the Supream head of the Church, without whose Authority no person can or ought to exercise any Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or proceed to any Censure; it demonstrates that by the Royal Power an *Heretick* might be pun-

punished with a Civil and Corporeal Mulct. Farther the *Star-Chamber* was an ancient Court grounded upon the common Law of *England*, and confirmed by Act of Parliament. Which Court took cognizance not onely of Civil Crimes but also of Ecclesiastical, and did punish *Hereticks* by Imprisoning, Fineing and Stigmatizing, as appears by the Records of that Court; and that famous Instance of *Thrask*, who in the 16. year of King *James* for spreading of *Judaical Heresies*, he was cited into the Court and being obsti-

nate

nate v  
in the  
Fleet,  
all wh  
which  
there  
Mr. A  
the F  
being,  
by wh  
be pu  
by th  
the C  
that b  
Engla  
durin  
Comm  
suffer  
Purse

nd  
her  
ci-  
on  
ad,  
of  
fr  
ly  
of  
n-  
e.  
ds  
a-  
'g  
a-  
e

nate was sentenced to be set  
in the Pillory, Whipt to the  
Fleet, Fined and Imprisoned,  
all which was executed: by  
which it appears what truth  
there is in this assertion of  
Mr. *Hobs*. During the Time  
the *High Commission* was in  
being, there was no Statute  
by which an *Heretick* might  
be punished otherwise than  
by the ordinary Censure of  
the Church, for 'tis proved  
that by the Common Law of  
*England* and the Statute Law  
during the time of the *High  
Commission*, *Hereticks* might  
suffer in their Bodies and  
Purses: hence it follows that  
*He.*

*Heresy* was criminal, and hath not vindicated himself from that contradiction which he stands charged. He farther proceeds, That no Doctrine could be accounted *Heresy*, unless Commissioners had actually declared and published, that what was made *Heresy* by the Four first general Councils should be *Heresie*: but I never heard yet there was any such declaration made either by Proclamation, by Recording in Churches, or by Printing, as is requisite in Penal Laws. We have before proved that the High Com-

mission

mission  
 es of H  
 Chure  
 conde  
 fully  
 expect  
 are f  
 those  
 Four  
 receiv  
 conde  
 ratifi  
 Chur  
 suffic  
 Nice  
 comp  
 gene  
 ever  
 and

*mission* was not the Sole Judges of *Heresy*. That which the Church and Law of *England* condemns for *Heresy*, is as fully divulged as can be expected. The 39. Articles are sufficiently known, and those Doctrines which the Four first general Councils received as Orthodox, or condemned as Heretical, are ratifi'd by the Law and Church of *England*, and sufficiently promulged: The *Nicene* Creed which was completed by the Fourth general Council. is read in every Church on Sundaies and Holy daies: The *Athana-*  
*sian*

*sian* Creed is to be read at peculiar Festivals, both which Creeds, as also the Apostles, are part of the *Liturgy* of the Church, which is imbodyed into the Laws of the Land, and that the opinions which are contrary, are made Heretical appears by these Clauses of the *Athanasian* Creed, *He therefore that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity.* Furthermore it is Necessary to Everlasting Salvation that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ: and this Clause ends the Creed, *This is the Catholick Faith which except a*  
man

man believe Faithfully he cannot  
 be saved. The Doctrines there-  
 fore declared to be Hereti-  
 cal are sufficiently, by Print-  
 ing and Recording in Church-  
 es, divulged. To alleviate  
 his Crime, or at least to vindi-  
 cate himself from Heresie, he  
 reflects upon our late sad  
 distractions, w<sup>ch</sup> to me admi-  
 nisters matter of horror. Be-  
 fore arms were taken up,  
 saith he, the King abolish-  
 ed the *High Commission*, but  
 the Parliament pursued the  
 Rebellion, and put down  
 both *Episcopacy* and *Monar-  
 chy*, erecting a power, by  
 them called a *Common wealth*,  
 N by

‘by others the *Rump*, which  
‘men obeyed not out of Duty  
‘but Fear, those actions were  
dreadfull, and are the font-  
nels of all those fears which  
now afflict us. The just prin-  
ciples by which Government  
is formed and established,  
and reasonable laws are en-  
acted, deservedly reprove  
and condemn those actions  
perpetrated in our late con-  
fusions, which gave a scan-  
dall to our Religion and Na-  
tion: But how can he cast  
odium upon those actions  
his sentiments justify. Said  
‘he, there were no human  
‘Laws left in force to re-  
strain



strain any man from  
Preaching, or Writing any  
Doctrine concerning Reli-  
gion that he pleased. And  
in this time it was, that a  
book called the *Leviathan*  
was writ in defence of the  
Kings Power Spiritual or  
Temporal, without any  
word against Episcopacy,  
or against Bishop, or a-  
gainst the publick Doctrine  
of the Church. To which  
is thus Replied, the *Levia-  
than* was impresse 1651,  
and come out in Latine upon  
his Majesties returne. In 48  
England was totally subdu-  
ed to the Power of the

the Rump, Ireland in 49. Scotland in 50. was almost reduced by the Rump, and his Majesties Army totally routed at Worcester, in this year the *Leviathan* was published, as was this Book in defence of the Kings Power, Spiritual and Temporal, when his Majestie was in Banishment. His Majestie was then deprived of all his lawfull Power and Authority, and forced into Exile. This *Leviathan*, if the Principles were admitted, justified the Actions of his Enemies: he casts this Imputation on the Rump, that they were obeyed onely for

for  
he  
man  
of  
is  
drea  
incid  
make  
Soci  
it be  
Fear  
to G  
ding  
be co  
same  
and t  
of Na  
and  
not

for fear; in the same book he endeavours to prove that man is not by Nature a lover of Society, but at his original is in a State of War; The dread of the Evils which are incident to that condition, makes him to enter into a Society with others; and let it be considered, whether, if Fear be the great inducement to Government, they according to his Principles are to be condemned who out of the same fear obeyed the *Rump*; and that the fundamental law of Nature is *self Preservation*, and for fear that end should not be attained, pacts are entered

entred into, but if after those pacts that design cannot be accomplished, then pacts are void: and therefore if people have a suspicion that the Prince will destroy them, they may take up Arms. And if the Prince be devested of his Government, the People are no longer obliged to obey him, and upon this account of *Self-Preservation*, they are to submit to those who can protect them. Upon this reason the taking the Engagement was lawful, and it was his honour to present to the *English* Nation those Principles w<sup>ch</sup> induced  
ma

many to take the Engage-  
ment.

*Oliver* gaining the *Protector-  
ship*, was so pleased with him  
on those accounts, that the  
great place of being *Secreta-  
ry* was profered him. If these  
things be true, (as unquesti-  
onably they are) let it then  
be considered, whether any  
Sober man can believe that  
the Book called the *Levia-  
than* was writ in defence of  
the Kings Power, Tempo-  
ral and Ecclesiastical; since  
it manifestly asserts the cause  
of Usurpers. It must be grant-  
ed that Mr. *Hobs* doth give  
to the Sovereign all illimited  
pow-

power in things just and fa-  
 ered. But this he gives to all  
 sorts of Government, to *A-*  
*ristocracy* and *Democracy* as  
 well as *Monarchy*.

A Book to be penned and  
 published by him, when all  
 the Kings Dominions were  
 in the Power of those who  
 took up Arms against him,  
 which containes these Doct-  
 tines. *Pag.* 112. ' But in case  
 ' a great many men have al-  
 ' ready resisted the Sovereign  
 ' Power unjustly, or com-  
 ' mitted some Capital Crime,  
 ' for which every one of them  
 ' expects Death, whether  
 ' have they not the Libertie  
 then

then to joyn together, and as-  
 sist, and defend one another?  
 certainly they have: for they  
 but defend their lives,  
 which the Guilty man may  
 as well do, as the Innocent.  
 There was indeed Injustice  
 in the first breach of their  
 Duty: Their bearing of  
 Arms subsequent to it, tho  
 it be to maintain what they  
 have done, is no new un-  
 just Act: and if it be  
 only to defend their per-  
 sons it is not unjust at all.  
 Pag. 114. The Obligati-  
 on of Subjects to the Sove-  
 raign is understood to last  
 as long and no longer than  
 the

'the power lasteth, by  
 'which he is able to protect  
 'them. For the Right men  
 'have by nature to protect  
 'themselves, when none else  
 'can protect them, can by  
 'no covenant be relinquish-  
 'ed: The Sovereignty is  
 'the Soul of the Common-  
 'wealth; which once depar-  
 'ted from the body, the  
 'members do no more recieve  
 'their motion from it. *Pag.*  
 '174. When in a War (for-  
 'raine or intestine) the E-  
 'nemies get a final Victory,  
 'so as the forces of the Com-  
 'mon Wealth keeping the  
 'Field no longer) there is no  
 ther

'ther p  
 'in th  
 'the C  
 'ved  
 'ty t  
 'such  
 'creti  
 'him  
 'the  
 'Life  
 'Con  
 'pirin  
 'gove  
 'than  
 'by  
 'mon  
 'Rig  
 'nar  
 'ed



ther protection of Subjects  
in their Loyalty: then is  
the Common-wealth dissol-  
ved, and every man at liber-  
ty to protect himself by  
such causes as his own dis-  
cretion shall suggest un-  
to him. For the Sovereign is  
the publick Soul, giving  
Life and motion to the  
Common-wealth, which ex-  
piring, the Members are  
governed by it no more,  
than the Carcass of a man  
by his departed (tho im-  
mortal) Soul. Fortho the  
Right of a Sovereign Mon-  
arch cannot be extinguish-  
ed by the Act of another:  
yet

yet the Obligation of the  
 members may. For he that  
 wants protection may seek  
 it any where, and when he  
 hath it, is obliged (without  
 fraudulent pretence of ha-  
 ving submitted himself out  
 of fear) to protect his  
 Protector as long as he is a-  
 ble. It was so far from de-  
 fending His Majesties Au-  
 thority, that without Com-  
 mand they plainly justified  
 the actions of his usurping  
 Enemies. No person that hath  
 sucked in *Hobs* his Principles,  
 can be a loyal Subject, and  
 hence likewise it appears,  
 that he did not ingeniously  
 with

the with his Majesty, when he  
ha averts in his Apology for his  
leek *Leviathan*, in an Epistle dedi-  
he cated to the King, before *Pro-*  
out *blemata Phisica, nec vitio vertant*  
ha *quod contra Hostes pugnans &c.*  
out Let none account me a Cri-  
his minal, that fighting against  
s a your Enemies I took what  
de Arms I could, and Brandish-  
Au ed a two Edged Sword; cer-  
om tainly those Propositions  
ifie Fought against his Majesty,  
ing and defended the Cause of  
ath of his Enemies; That in the  
les, same book he did write a-  
and gainst Bishops and the Doct-  
rs, rine of the Church of *Eng-*  
ally *land* is manifestly proved be-  
with  
O fore

fore. In the Common-Prayer book are contained several Doctrines of the Church of *England*, to oppose or deny which (as Mr. *Hobs* doth in the aforesaid book) is made Criminal, that is to be punished by the Civil magistrate, by the first of Queen *Eliza*. *Cap. 2.* The Title of which is, That there be Uniformity of Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, in which there are these words.

‘ Be it enacted, that every Person or Persons whatsoever-  
 ‘ that shall in any Interludes  
 ‘ Plays, Songs, Rhymes, or by  
 ‘ any other open words declare

‘clare or ſpeak any thing de-  
‘praving or deſpiſeing the  
‘ſame Boock, or any part  
‘thereof, or any thing there-  
‘in contained, then the par-  
‘ty convicted ſhall forfeit to  
‘the Queen for the firſt  
‘Offence an Hundred Marks.  
He concludes this Tract with  
caſting an odious and falſe  
ſcandal upon the whole  
Chriſtian Clergy; Down  
from the whole Council of  
Nice to this preſent time, in  
theſe words;

‘So fierce are men for the  
‘moſt part in diſpute, where  
‘either their Learning or  
‘Power is debated, that they

' never think of the Laws,  
 ' but as soon as they are  
 ' offended they cry out Cru-  
 ' cify, forgetting what *Paul*  
 ' saith, even in case of obsti-  
 ' nate holding of an Error. 2.  
 ' *Tim.* 24. 25. The Servant  
 ' of the Lord must not strive,  
 ' but be gentle unto all men,  
 ' apt to Teach, Patient, in  
 ' Meekness Instructing those  
 ' that oppose, if God perad-  
 ' venture may give them Re-  
 ' pentance to the acknow-  
 ' ledging of the Truth. Tis  
 true both the Bishops and  
 the Presbyterians did accuse  
 that Book (in the Parlia-  
 ment) of Heresy: why could  
 they

they  
 ning  
 not d  
 fesses  
 not v  
 or le  
 make  
 tis  
 the  
 fer  
 been  
 ly c  
 wen  
 sing  
 Bla  
 Ze  
 ha  
 vi  
 th

they be fierce, their learning and their power being not disputed, when he professes in that book he medled not with them, their powers or learning. Those things make not the Clergy fierce; tis the Person, the Religion, the Faith of the Holy Jesus for which the Clergy have been and are still so Zealously contending; they are, and were piously fierce in opposing prophane Heresies, and Blasphemous Impieties; the Zeal of the Lord of Hosts hath eaten up those holy Divines; their zelous defence of the Doctrine of their master hath

hath not violated the Apostles direction given to the Pastors of the Church *2. Tim.* that reaches only those who erred through infirmity, not obstinacy. Contumacious Hereticks they are bound to oppose withall Holy Zeal and Indignation. Did not he blush to averr that they cryed Crucifie, when they knew not the Law. Could they be ignorant of that Law which they themselves put in execution. Their ignorance of the Law did not make them cry Crucifie, but knowing the Law and Gospel became profest Enemies to those who by their

their  
Cruc  
Glor  
W  
upon  
the  
such  
that  
cal  
the  
clud  
Gre  
gre  
nes  
duc  
on  
co  
ftl  
IO



their Antichristian opinions  
Crucifie again the Lord of  
Glory.

What Reproach casts he  
upon Religion when he loads  
the Christian Divines with  
such imputations. Those  
that are verſt in Eccleſiaſti-  
cal Hiſtory, and have read  
the Fathers, cannot but con-  
clude that the *Baſil's*, the  
*Gregory's* &c. were men as  
great for Learning and Good-  
neſs as the World ever pro-  
duced; their fervent oppoſiti-  
on of Hereticks was not  
contrariant to that Apo-  
ſtliocal Precept. *Titus 3.*  
*10. An Heretick after the*  
*first*

first and second Admonition  
reject, 2 Pet. 2. 1. If any one  
bring another Doctrine, receive  
him not into your house, nor bid  
him good speed. down from  
the Apostles time to this  
day have and will be till  
Christ come to Judgement,  
zealous and Pious opposers  
of those who privately bring  
in damnable Heresies deny-  
ing the Lord that bought  
them.

**F I N I S.**

ion  
one  
ive  
bid  
om  
his  
till  
at,  
rs  
ng  
y-  
ght